## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

JOHN FOLKS,	)	
Petitioner,	)	
V.	)	Civ.Act.No. 07-334-***
THOMAS CARROLL, Warden	)	
and <b>JOSEPH R. BIDEN, III</b> , Attorney General for the State of Delaware	)	
General for the State of Delaware	)	
Respondents.	)	

#### MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

Pursuant to Rule 6 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, respondents move for an extension of time in which to file an answer to the petition. In support thereof, respondents state the following:

- 1. The petitioner, John Folks, has applied for federal habeas relief, alleging error by the trial court. D.I. 2. By the terms of the Court's order, the answer is due to be filed on October 12, 2007.
- 2. Counsel has been, and continues to be, diligently working on numerous cases before this Court and the state courts. However, due to the ongoing litigation challenging the Delaware death penalty protocol, the workload for the Appeals Division attorneys not directly involved has greatly increased. Counsel is doing his best to prioritize cases by date received. Further, the Chief of the Appeals Division must review all filings prior to submission and has been unable to do so due to his own substantial caseload. In light of the situation, additional time is needed to complete the answer and have it reviewed in the ordinary course of business.

- 3. Under Habeas Rule 4, the Court has the discretion to give respondents an extension of time exceeding the 40-day limit in Civil Rule 81(a)(2). *Clutchette v. Rushen*, 770 F.2d 1469, 1473-74 & n.4 (9th Cir. 1985); *Kramer v. Jenkins*, 108 F.R.D. 429, 431-32 (N.D. Ill. 1985). The comment to Rule 4 expressly states that the district court has "the discretion to take into account various factors such as the respondent's workload" in determining the period of time that should be allowed to answer the petition.
  - 4. This is respondents' second request for an extension of time in this case.
- 5. Respondents submit that an extension of time to and including October 24, 2007, in which to file an answer is reasonable. Respondents submit herewith a proposed order.

/s/ James T. Wakley
Deputy Attorney General
Department of Justice
820 N. French Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 577-8500
Del. Bar. ID No. 4612

DATE: October 12, 2007

### **RULE 7.1.1 CERTIFICATION**

I hereby certify that I have neither sought nor obtained the consent of the petitioner, who is incarcerated and appearing *pro se*, to the subject matter of this motion.

/s/ James T. Wakley
Deputy Attorney General
Department of Justice
820 N. French Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 577-8500
Counsel for Respondents

Date: October 12, 2007

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on October 12, 2007, I electronically filed the attached documents with the Clerk of Court using CM/ECF. I also hereby certify that on October 12, 2007, I have mailed by United States Postal Service, the same documents to the following non-registered participant:

John Folks SBI#00126234 Delaware Correctional Center 1181 Paddock Road Smyrna, DE 19977

> /s/ James T. Wakley Deputy Attorney General Department of Justice 820 N. French Street Wilmington, DE 19801 (302) 577-8500 Del. Bar. ID No. 4612 james.wakley@state.de.us

Date: October 12, 2007

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

JOHN FOLKS,	)
Petitioner,	) )
v.  THOMAS CARROLL, Warden and JOSEPH R. BIDEN, III, Attorney General for the State of Delaware	) Civ.Act.No. 07-334-*** ) ) )
Respondents.	)
O	PRDER
Thisday of	, 2006,
WHEREAS, respondents having re	equested an extension of time in which to file
an answer, and	
WHEREAS, it appearing to the Co	ourt that the requested extension is timely made
and good cause has been shown for the ex	tension,
IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that re	espondents' answer shall be filed on or before
October 24, 2007.	
	United States District Judge